

**DCSS P3 PROGRAM
JOINT ATTORNEY/CASEWORKER STAFFING WORKGROUPS
SEPTEMBER 14, 2000 MEETING
MEETING SUMMARY**

A. GENERAL

On Thursday, September 14, 2000, the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) Policies, Procedures, and Practices (P3) Project, Attorney and Caseworker Staffing Workgroups held a joint meeting in Sacramento. The following members attended:

- ☒ Antonia Agerbek County Co-Leader (Sonoma County) – Staffing Attorney
- ☒ Cherie Karnes (Medium County) – Staffing Caseworker
- ☒ Janice Doi, Medium County (Santa Clara County) – Staffing Attorney
- ☒ Mike Farrell, DCSS Co-Leader – Staffing Attorney, Staffing Caseworker
- ☒ Hossein Mofakhar, DCSS Analyst – Staffing Attorney, Staffing Caseworker
- ☒ Brian Hocking (Large County) – Staffing Caseworker
- ☒ Bruce Patterson, Large County Rep (Los Angeles County) – Staffing Attorney
- ☒ Kathy Yolton (County Co-Leader) – Staffing Caseworker

Attending *ex officio* was:

- ☒ Larry Wilson, Facilitator (SRA International)

Housekeeping and meeting minute duties were addressed: Bruce Patterson is to submit meeting minutes.

B. TODAY'S TENTATIVE AGENDA

- Review Short Reports
- Forum Presentations
- Caseworker-to-Attorney Activity Matrix
- Data Summary Review by Hossein
- Approaches by the Workgroups

C. SHORT REPORTS

Larry Wilson requested that both groups review their Short Reports and make any final changes for submission. We discussed the format. The Steering Committee does not want background information in the Short Reports, which are intended to be stand-alone statements to be handed out for review before the public forum meetings. The assumption is that most people will come prepared, so they won't need a lot of background information. The purpose of the short report is to say, "Here are our thoughts; what do you think?" to the public. A more formal hearing will be held in the spring to allow more of the public to participate.

The Draft Final Report is completely different. In that report, we need to include what the Workgroup looked at, how the information was evaluated, and what factors influenced the group's recommendations. We should include all thoughts and intentions regarding the Workgroup's purpose, and address any legislative or regulatory changes we feel need to be changed.

The groups completed a review of each other's Short Report, making changes to some language used and attempting to align the caseworker and the attorney staffing reports. A question was raised regarding addressing clerical staffing. As Mike Farrell pointed out, we did not want to make a recommendation that did not take into account clerical support. The same is true regarding the attorneys and the support they receive from Law Clerks, Paralegals, and clerical support personnel.

The attendees discussed differences in their recommendation attributable to such factors as county size and how that might affect establishing one standard for all. After further discussion, changes were made and then forwarded to Betsy Schmidt.

D. FORUM PRESENTATIONS

The group discussed in detail the three forums that were scheduled, and went over the planned schedule of events for the upcoming Judicial Council meeting. Larry Wilson explained that there would be an overall presentation and an opportunity for each group to present their specific task until about 11:30. At that time, questions from the public will be gathered and sorted during lunch by the Steering Committee. After lunch, the Workgroup with the most questions will go first. The public will ask their questions, and the Workgroup members will be given a chance to respond. There will be an attempt to keep the questions direct and not wander. In the evening session, it will be more of an open microphone forum, and we are not sure what to expect there.

It was asked whether it would be possible to get a copy of the questions even 20 minutes before the audience starts asking them to give the members a chance to review and prepare. Larry was unsure whether time would permit such a prep break, but he will check.

We don't want to limit information; however there is not a lot of time, so presenters should try to take a narrow focus. As more information on the forums comes in, it will be distributed immediately.

It was asked whether it would be possible to get the Q&As from previous forums to be shared with the later forums and the public to help reduce crossover questions between the two forums? Larry will check on this as well.

E. MATRIX OF ATTORNEY DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The group discussed items and differences in each county. After a lengthy discussion, Larry suggested that we seek clarification from the state regarding organizational structure, the

caseworker's role/responsibility, and the attorney's role/responsibility. The Workgroups did not make a decision on these issues.

F. HOSSEIN's STUDY OF DATA

This item was moved forward in the meeting to allow Hossein Moftakhar the opportunity to address the group, as he would be leaving early to attend another meeting. Hossein commented on a report he prepared for both groups that consolidated the findings from both surveys of counties. Some discrepancies were identified and discussed. He also prepared a cost effectiveness Normal Distribution chart and discussed its significance. There were limited questions regarding the information he provided.

G. APPROACHES BY THE WORKGROUPS

Larry Wilson stated that it is very important to make recommendations to the state regarding what studies need to be performed, what next steps need to be taken, and what specific variances or issues should be addressed in those studies. This is perhaps one of the most important items that can come from the P3 efforts.

At the conclusion of the meeting, members discussed the potential usefulness of more meetings between the two Workgroups before the end of the P3 project. It was decided that this could generate a lot of information; however, the time constraints on the two Workgroups would not allow it.